

P15733.A11

claims 45, 48 - 50, 62, 80, 98, 99, 105 - 107, and 116. In view of the amendments, it is believed that all of the claims are now allowable over the prior art of record.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner has rejected all of the pending claims. In particular, claims 45 - 123 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because of the phrase "capable of." With the present amendment, the phrase has been deleted from the claims. Thus, it is requested that the §112 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 45, 46, 51 - 65, 70 - 73, 76 - 91, 94 - 103, and 108 - 123 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over GRIFFITH et al. in view of LANTTO. Claims 47 - 50, 66 - 69, 74, 75, 92, 93, and 104 - 107 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over GRIFFITH et al. in view of LANTTO, and further in view of MIZIKOVSKY. Applicants traverse the rejections and respectfully request an indication of the allowability of all pending claims.

It is believed that all grounds of rejection are moot in view of the amended claims. That is, it is submitted that none of the references of record show two or more autonomous networks connected between two devices. The claimed autonomous networks are not connected to one another and have no arrangements with one another. Further, the references do not show that the connections can be monitored and are available for data transmission (claims 45, 62, and 80), which includes transmitting and receiving. The references also do not show that the transmission can occur over a plurality of parallel dissimilar networks when a single transmission is initiated, as recited in amended claims 45, 62, and 98. For at least these reasons, it is submitted that all of the pending claims are allowable over the prior art of record. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner pass the present application to allowance.

It is noted that an international preliminary examination report has issued in counterpart PCT application no. PCT/US98/18491. Because the Examiner in the present application is the same as in the PCT application, and because the references cited in the PCT application are the same as in the present application, an Information Disclosure Statement is not being submitted.

Entry of the present Amendment is believed to be proper, even though the present application is subject to final rejection. That is, the present amendments to the claims merely remove a term that the Examiner indicated is indefinite and recite features discussed during the interview. Furthermore, it is believed that because the Examiner has already searched the subject matter of the present Amendment in the counterpart PCT application, no additional work or search by the Examiner is necessitated by the present Amendment. Consequently, entry of the present Amendment, and allowance of claims 45 - 123, is deemed proper.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this response or the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
William DOVIAK et al.

William E. Zyskind Reg. No.
Neil F. Greenblum 41,568
Reg. No. 28,394

December 14, 1999
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1941 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191